Opposition to construction of Jetties at Bhaitarkanika Sanctuary in Orissa

1282. SHRI B. K. HARIPRASAD: Will the Minister of ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are aware of the strong opposition mounted by environment protection lobby in Orissa to check the Orissa Government's move to construct jetties at the Bhaitarkanika Sanctuary for development of fisheries in a chronically impoverished region;

(b) whether Government have examined the green lobby's viewpoint aimed to ensure protection and survival of endangered Oile ridley turtles in their premeval habitat;

(c) whether Government are going to succumb to green-lobby's pressure, thereby denying additional income generation opportunities to the fisher-folk in the area through development of jetty facilities;

Id) what is being done by Government that even after 34 years since laying foundation stone by Jawaharlal Nehru the Sardar Sarovar Project is nowhere) near take-off in the face of dogged opposition from green-lobbies, thereby denying the residents of Southern Gujarat liberation from water-starvation and an economic transformation; and

(e) whether Government would put due weightage for poverty alleviation programme over environmental protection?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS (SHRI KAMAL NATH): (a) and (b) Ves, Sir. A large number of individuals and organisations have written! to the Government opposing the construtions of jetties in the Bhiterkauika Sanctuary which is a very important wildlife refuge, particularly as a habitat for the endangered Olive Ridley Turtles. The view point expressed in these representations is generally justified because such activities are in-consistent with the objectives of development and management of a wildlife sanctuary. A team of officers from this Ministry had visited the sanctuary and recommended against construction of the jetties, roads and bridges. Accordingly, the matter has been taken up with the State Govt, of Orissa to suspend all such construction work pending receipt of the report of Environmental Impact Assessment. Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun, has also initiated a study on the marine turtles in the area.

(c) There is no question of succumbing to any pressure because only such activities which are consistent with the objectives of a wildlife protected area can be allowed by the Chief Wildlife Warden of the State . The case of Bhitarkanika Sanctuary is presently subdice in the High Court of Orissa.

(d) The Sardar Sarovar project was accorded environmental clearance in June. 1987 with a number of safeguard measures for environmental protection. The proposal was subsequently approved by the Planning Commission and the project is presently under execution.

(e) Goernment always endeavours to give due weightage to the respective needs of poverty alleviation as well as environmental protection, and the two concepts are not always mutually antagonistic The constant attempt is to strike a harmonious balance between the two.

Industrial Pollution in Gujarat

1283. SHRI RAJUBHAI A. PARMAR: Will the Minister of ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS be pleased to state:

(a) the name and number of sugar units and other industrial units causing pollution in Gujarat, stating the location thereof;

(b) the reasons for not using anti-pollution measures by these units in the; State; and

(c) the details of the action taken by Government against those mills so far?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS (SHRI KAMAL NATH): (a) There are sixteen sugar mills located in Gujarat. Of these two mills namely Charotar Sahakari Khand Udyog Ltd, and Shree Bileshwar Khand Udyog Sahakari Mandli Ltd. were not meeting the prescribed standards for effluent disposal. However, these are closed at present.

Other industrial units causing pollution are about 2250, mainly in the small scale sector. These are primarily located in Gujarat Industrial Development Corporation (GIDC) estates at Naroda, Odhaw, Vatya, Nadesari, Ankleshwar, Panoli, Pandesara, Sachin, Vapi and Sarigam. These units are mainly engaged in manufacture of dyes, dye intermediates, bulk drugs, and fine chemicals.

(b) The reasons for not providing full scale anti-pollution measures include lack of finance and space, non-availability of technology and default by the industries.

(c) The action taken against the defaulting units, and generally to reduce the pollution level, include the following:

(i) The Gujarat State Pollution Control Board has issued directions to industries under the provision of the water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974 and Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981 to comply with the prescribed standards and action has been initiated against the defaulting industries.

(ii) Effluent and emission standards have been prescribed under the Environment (Protection) Act. 1986.

(iii) Environmental guidelines have been evolved for siting and operation of industries.

(iv) Industries have been directed to comply with consent requirements of the State Pollution Control Boards.

(v) Financial incentives are provided for installation of pollution control equipment and shifting of polluting industries from, congested areas to conforming industrial estates. Financial incentives are also given for utilisation of solid waste such as fly ash and phospho-gypsum.

(vi) A scheme has been started by the Central Government where 25 per cent of the Cost subject to a maximum of Rs. 50 lakhs is given as subsidy for setting up a common effluent treatment facility in clusters of small scale industrial units. The subsidy is subject to a matching share being provided by the State Government.

Climate summit in Berlin

1284. SHRI B. K. HARIPRASAD: Will the Minister of ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS be pleased to state:

(a) Whether the agenda for the climate summit to be held in Berlin in March-April, 1995, contains a proposal or consideration to pressurise countries like India to curtail use of coal in order to reduce Carbon dioxide emissions beyond permitted levels;

(b) whether India was represented at the preparatory meeting to the Climate Summit recently held in New York and if so, what was the reaction of our delegation members to such a move; and

(c) whether Government are aware of subtle pressure applied by the developed nations on multilateral banks like World Bank and Asian Development Bank to stop funding projects in countries like India which lead of Green House gas emissions, thus leading to curtailment ofcoal consumption and if so, what is Government's reaction?